

To Department of Planning and Environment

email community@planning.nsw.gov.au

Attn: Ms Grace MacDonald

From: Susan and Alan Burkin

Property: 9, O'Dell Street, Vineyard, NSW 2765

Date February 20, 2017

We recently attended the information session for the Vineyard Precinct Plan Stage 1. and following discussions with you personally at that time, you assured us that any concerns should be put in writing and forwarded to you and that they would be taken into account and given every consideration.

The issues that concern us not only affect our property but a number of neighbouring properties backing onto the Killarney Chain of Ponds Creek.

One only has to stand and observe the lay of the land to see that a great injustice is taking place by omitting the frontage of our property and the property next door to us.

It hardly seems feasible that after living in this street for all these years that the flood levels are now being heightened to such an extent that it leaves our block in what could now be classified as totally flood prone land. We have flood maps clearly stating that the 1:100 year flood level only encroaches the bottom end of the land which is over 270 metres in length.

Would it not be unreasonable to assume that with the further upgrading of Warragamba Dam by some 14 meters in recent times at a cost of many billions of dollars, that the expected flood levels would diminish considerably rather than to our detriment, moving the flood line up higher. Why perform such extensive mitigation works like this at such enormous cost if not to assist the population and landowners down stream in the Hawkesbury region

One would also expect that along with the flood mitigation works of the Warragamba Dam, that the works completed on the Penrith Lakes Scheme would also assist landowners in the Hawkesbury. Are we to be told now that all the billions of dollars spent on these two projects alone, that our flood levels along the Killarney Chain of Ponds is now actually on the rise.

May I suggest that if our levels are on the rise because of the developments taking place 'up stream' east of Vineyard namely Schofields, Rouse Hill and Box Hill to the detriment of suburbs such as Vineyard, Oakville and McGraths Hill, then if anything

we should now be compensated for the land we purchased in good faith knowing where the 1:100 flood level was.

I would like to suggest that once works are completed on the Killarney Chain of Ponds and the new bridge constructions on both Boundary Road and Chapman Road, then the flow of water will have ease of movement rather than banking up around our properties in O'Dell Street.

Land fill, whether legal or illegal, worries us and witnessing the land movements even in the neighbouring Hills of Carmel, who can say how the running of the Killarney Chain of Ponds will flow in the next heavy rains.

Our main points of concern:-

1. Looking at your map on page 4 of the Vineyard Precinct Planning Stage 1. It can clearly be seen that the whole top area along the front of our Property No 9 O'Dell Street, (an area of approximately 60 meters by 120 meters) and No.8 O'Dell Street, (an area with not quite the same road frontage but possibly the same size) are both above your new 1:100 year flood line, therefore, why would it not be possible to zone the top of our properties No 9 and No.8, in the same category as surrounding neighbouring properties i.e. Low Density Residential. And below the 'blue' line on your plan could remain as Environmental Living.
2. I would also like you to confirm our conversation where you stated that should our block and other 5 acre blocks not be included in the new development plans that 'Environmental Lifestyle' land can accommodate 1 home per 2,500 square metres, which equates to 8 homes per 5 acre block.
3. Could you also advise if 8 homes, not necessarily of equal land size but 8 homes or less within the 5 acres would be permissible and any development would be in line with established properties along the O'Dell street line. Could you advise if this would be permissible.

This information would be beneficial to any prospective purchaser or developer.

I do feel that these points of contention need to be addressed now at the initial planning stage rather than putting us in the too hard basket for the time being.

I look forward to a response from you on behalf of your Department in the not too distant future.

Yours sincerely,

Susan and Alan Burkin

Phone: 9627 4159

Mobile: 043 001 1915

1 in 20
13.3 m
1 in 50
1 in 100
17.2 m
July 1969
14.2



